Ch196 396

D575

A DECLARATION CONCERNING THE PUBLIKE DISPUTE

WHICH

Should have been in the Publike Meeting-House of Alderman-Bury, the 3d. of this instant Moneth of *December*;

Concerning Infants-Baptisme.

Together, with some of the Arguments which should then have been propounded and urged by some of those that are falsly called Anabaptists, which should then have disputed.

Viz. By { BENJAMIN COXE. HANSERD KNOLLYS. WILLIAM KIFFEN, &c.

Published for the satisfaction of those that desire information

2 COR. 10. 3. 4, 5.

For the weapons of our warfare are not carnall, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds.

LONDON, Printed in the Year, 1645.

18

DECLARATION

CONCERNING

A Declaration, concerning the Publike Diſpute, which ſhould have been in the Publike Meeting Houſe of *Alderman-Bury*, the 3. of of this inſtant *December*.

A Merchant of this City, taking knowledge of different doctrines and Adminiſtrations of Baptiſme, publikely held forth both in preaching and practice; ſome doubts did ariſe in his minde, which of the ſaid Doctrines and Adminiſtrations was according to the will of God; who being deſirous to try all things, and hold faſt that which is good; ſearched the Scriptures daily, and upon examination found, The doctrine and adminiſtration of baptiſme touching Believers, who make profeſſion of faith, and manifeſt the fruits of repentance, to be more agreeable to the Scriptures, then the doctrine and adminiſtration of baptiſme touching the Infants of Believers, ſo farre forth as he could diſcern. Yet becauſe he would not lean to his own underſtanding, he earneſtly deſired, and at length (after much paines and entreaties) obtained a conference and private diſputation between us, and Mr. *Callamy*, and ſome of his Brethren, at the Merchants own houſe (unto which were admitted divers of his friends) and ſome ſtrangers,) that he might hear both parties face to face, maintain their own doctrine and practice about baptiſme, for his own and his wives ſatisfaction (being great with childe) at the end of which private diſpute, the Merchant and divers others preſent, not having received ſatisfaction, touching the lawfulneſſe of baptizing the Infants of Believers; There was appointed another day for diſpute at Mr. *Maſcals* houſe, and Mr. *Callamy* undertook to prove, That ſome of the Infants of Believers ought to be baptized. But the multitudes of people that

came thither, hindered that disputе; for we could not get in to dis-pute, for the croud of the people; whereupon we all agreed, to crave leave of the civill Magistrate, to have liberty to dispute in some pub-like place.

And it is not unknown to many in this City, That a publike dispute touching the lawfulnesse of Pædobaptisme, between us, and Mr. *Cal-lamy*, Mr. *Cranford*, with some others, was agreed upon; and hav-ing first obtained leave of the Lord Major, by the request of three Common-councell men (whom we joyntly intreated to move his Lordship in all our Names) we privately consulted together, at Mr. *Callamy's* house, how we might manage that publike dispute, to the glory of God, and the satisfaction of the people: And we mutu-ally agreed to hold that publike Disputation, in the Parish Church (as men call it) of Alderman-bury, upon the third day of this instant December, from nine a clock in the morning, untill three a clock in the Afternoon: There should have been sixe on each partie, whereof two were to be appointed Moderators: One of the Moderators was to begin with prayer, and the other to conclude with prayer, after the Dispute was ended: Also both parties chose Mr. *Hale* to be our No-tary, whom we all desired, that (prayer being ended) before we begun to dispute, he would reade this following Agreement in the eares of all the people there present.

The Agreement.

IT is agreed on both sides, that this Disputation shall conti-nue for sixe houres; they that begin to dispute, shall dispute for two houres, and then the contrary partie for two houres more; and then the first partie shall dispute again the fifth hour, and the other partie the sixth hour; with this proviso, *that if any do desire liberty to exceed the time allotted, the same liberty shall be granted to the other side, not exceeding half an hour.*

It is likewise agreed, that at the end of each dispute, the Mo-derator on that partie that disputes, shall faithfully and conscien-tiously give the result, both of the Arguments and the Answers.

398

Its likewise agreed, that the Disputation shall be Logicall, and each side shall endeavour to make his answers as short as he can possibly.

It is also much desired by both parties, that there be no disturbance offered by any one whatsoever, either by hissing, or humming, or laughing, or talking.

It is likewise professed, that both sides are willing to declare, and will as occasion shall serve, declare ingenuously what they hold, according as they shall be desired in the disputation about the subject-matter of the dispute.

And lastly, both parties do seriously and solemnly professe, that they come hither with a resolution to give or receive light, according as God shall offer it; and not to dispute for Victory, but truth.

The Question to be disputed this day is;

Whether the Infants of believing Parents ought to be baptized, or no?

Mr. Callamy *is to prove, That all or some Infants of Believing Parents, ought to be baptized.*

And the other parties are to prove; That no Infants ought to be baptized.

But the Evening before the day agreed upon for that publike Dispute, some of us passing over the Exchange, saw an Order published by the Lord Major, to this effect;

That his Lordship thought fit upon serious consideration, for prevention of the inconveniencies that might happen thereby, to forbid the same Meeting and Disputation, upon that day, or at any other time, in a publike way; before his Lordship shall receive the pleasures of the Honourable Houses of Parliament touching the same; which with all convenience, his Lordship will endeavour to know, lest otherwise there might be hazard of the disturbance of the publike Peace.

Whereupon, we (who are falsely called Anabaptists,) being as ready to obey our Civill Magistrates, as to professe our subjection to his Authority in all lawfull commands; [Whatever is preached or printed of us by any to the contrary; and whosoever have, or shall accuse us, either to the Magistrates, or to the Common people, that we will not obey Authority, are false accusers of the Brethren; and we hope, that both the Magistrates, and the People have found them lyars, and will finde them so to be still, so often as just occasion shall be offered to manifest our willing and loyall subjection to the Magistrates Civill Authority] we were constrained in obedience to his Lordships lawfull power, to forbeare that intended and earnestly desired Disputation, and waite untill Mr. *Callamy* and his Brethren obtaine leave from Authority, to have liberty of a publique Dispute with us and our Brethren, which we hope the Lord Major will with all conveniency endeavour, according to his Lordships promise and ingagement; hoping also, that when they have said what they can by way of Argument, for their doctrine and practise, touching the Baptizing of the Infants of Beleevers, we shall obtaine the like equall liberty, both from the Civill Magistrates, and themselves, as publiquely to say what we can from the Scripture of truth, for our doctrine and practise, touching the baptizing of Beleevers; That they who shall heare our publique Disputations, may try all things, and hold fast that which is good. But, lest that some reports of us or our Brethren, which have beene given out, (by whom we know not) nay, we care not, with respect to our selves; for, we have learned to passe through good and evill reports, through the strength of Christ) yet lest, we say, those reports comming to the eare of Authority, should hinder them from granting this so much desired liberty of publique Dispute, we are forced to make this short Apologie. We will onely at this time make mention of two Reports amongst others, which we conceive are pertinent to the matter; to wit,

First, it was reported as if we intended to mannage that Dispute with our Swords, Clubs and Staves.

Secondly, that if Mr. *Callamy* escaped with his life, it would be well.

And here we think meete; First, to declare how we came to get some Hint of these two base and scandalous reports. We could not but take notice of the Reason expressed by the Lord Major, why his Lordship thought fit to prohibit our publique Dispute; (after he had

granted

granted that favour) to wit, *The hazard of the disturbance of the publique Peace: And, for the prevention of the inconveniences that may happen thereby.* Whereupon, we went to Mr. *Callamy*, and asked him, If he knew what occasioned the Lord Major to feare the disturbance of the Peace by such a Disputation, especially seeing we had his Lordships leave, and had agreed to mannage it in so peaceable a manner. Mr. *Callamy* told us, *That it was reported at the Lord Majors Table by some body (he knew not whom) that an Anabaptist, but he knew not who, said that he would bring his sword with him to the Dispute, or he would not come without his sword*; or words to that purpose: And Mr. *Callamy* also told us, *That a Woman told him, that some (no body knows who) should say, That if the publique Dispute held, Mr.* Callamy *would scarce escape with his life*: And other strange reports are whispered touching that Dispute, as if we were the cause of the Lord Majors forbidding of it; when as we were, and still are most desirous to have liberty to dispute publiquely with Mr. *Callamy*, and his Brethren. Now, as concerning those two Reports before mentioned, we do abhorre the thoughts of such a thing; as to mannage our Dispute with any other sword, then the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God; For, the weapons of our warfare are not carnall, but mighty through God, to the pulling downe of strong holds. And our agreement may give a sufficient testimony of the contrary, especially in these words, *it is much desired by both parties, that there be no disturbance offered by any one whatsoever, &c.*

And truly, we cannot but marvell, that either the Magistrates, or Inhabitants of this City, (who have had so much experience of the peaceable conversation of us, and our Brethren, called Anabaptists) should at any time heare such reports of us, without a just reproofe to those that doe bring them; yea, let any rationall man judge, whether we, who thinke it an unreasonable thing, that we should be beaten with Club-law instead of Arguments, should goe about to doe that to others, which we would not have them to doe to us. And, as for that other Report, concerning Mr. *Callamy*, It appeared to us, that Mr. *Callamy* neither feared, nor apprehended any such danger; for, he professed himselfe to be very willing and desirous that the Dispute should have held, and told us, he was much grieved that it was put off, and that he went to the Lord Major, and desired his Lordship not to forbid it, but could not prevaile with his Honour; onely the Lord Major promised Mr. *Callamy* to endeavour

deavour to know the pleaſure of the honourable Houſes of Parliament about it : And, Mr. *Callamy* told us, That Mr. Recorder would take a fit opportunity to move the honorable houſe of Commons concerning it; that ſo the Lord Major might know the pleaſure of both the honourable Houſes of Parliament : And, for as much as theſe reports, with divers others, are diſperſed, both in the City, and alſo in the Army, we are conſtrained to publiſh to the view of the world, ſome of the Arguments which we intended to have propounded to Mr. *Callamy* and his Brethren at that publique Diſpute; which were all the Swords and Clubs, or weapons, with which we intended to pull downe that ſtrong hold of Infant-baptiſme. That part of the Queſtion which we were to maintaine againſt Mr. *Callamy* and his Brethren was, That no Infants ought to be baptized.

No Infants ought to be baptized.

IF onely Believers themſelves ought to be baptized, then none of their Infants; But onely Believers themſelves ought to be baptiſed; *Ergo*, none of their Infants, &c. That Believers onely ought to be baptized, we thus prove: Such perſons as we reade in the Scripture of truth, *Iohn*, Chriſts Diſciples, and Apoſtles, adminiſtred Baptiſm unto, ſuch onely ought we to adminiſter Baptiſme unto; But we reade in the Scripture of truth, that *Iohn*, Chriſts Diſciples, and Apoſtles, adminiſtred Baptiſme to ſuch of the Jews only as repented, and to ſuch of the Gentiles only as beleeved, *Ergo*, Such only ought we to adminiſter Baptiſm unto, who do believe and repent. That *Iohn* adminiſtred Baptiſme to ſuch onely as repented, appeares both by his doctrine and practice; his doctrine you may reade, Matt. 3.1,2. and Acts 19.4,5. And *Iohns* practice was ſutable to his doctrine, Matth. 3.5,6. and Luke 3.3.12,13,16,18. And when ſome came to *Iohns* Baptiſme, who thought that they might have beene baptiſed, becauſe they were the children of *Abraham*; *Iohn* ſaid unto them, Bring forth fruit meet for repentance; and, thinke not to ſay within your ſelves, We have *Abraham* to our Father, Matt. 3.7,8. Giving them thereby to underſtand, that they muſt not have this Goſpell Ordinance of Baptiſme adminiſtred unto them (though they were the children of *Abraham*) untill they did actually repent, Acts 2.38. as if he had ſaid, What though you be the fleſhly ſeed of your beleeving Father *Abraham*, muſt you therefore be baptized before you repent? Thinke not ſo. Hereupon the Phariſees rejected the Counſell of God againſt themſelves, not being baptized of him, Luke 7.29,30. For, they are not all Iſrael which are of Iſrael; neither becauſe they are the ſeed of *Abraham*, are they all children; that is, they which are the children of the fleſh, theſe are not the children of God; but the children of the promiſe are counted for the ſeed, Rom. 9.6,7,8. and Gal. 3.26,27,29. That Chriſts

Argument 1.

Diſciples, and Apoſtles did adminiſter Baptiſme unto ſuch onely as beleeved and repented, alſo appeares by their doctrine and practiſe: Their doctrine you may reade, Acts 2.38. Acts 8.35,36,37. Act 16.30,31,32,33. Alſo their practiſe was according to their doctrine, both in Judea, Acts 2.41. and in Samaria, Acts 8.12. Alſo in Ceſarea, Acts 10.44,47,48. and in Macedonia, Acts 16.32,33,34. and in Achaia, Acts 18.8. and in Aſia the leſſe, Acts 19.1,3,4,5. And whereſoever there is mention made in the Scripture of their adminiſtration of Baptiſme, it was according to their doctrine of Baptiſme; and both their doctrine and practiſe was according to the Commiſſion and Inſtitution of Chriſt, Mat.28.19. Make Diſciples all Nations, baptizing them; to wit, who are made Diſciples by preaching, Joh. 4.1,2. ſo expounds μαθητεύειν Diſciple ye, μαθητὰς καὶ βαπτίζειν he made and baptiſed Diſciples. Alſo Marke 16.15,16. declares what our Saviour intended by the word Diſciples; to wit, Beleevers. He that beleeveth the Goſpell preached unto him, and is baptiſed, ſhall be ſaved. Thus the unprejudiced Reader may plainly perceive, that the harmony of Scriptures do witneſſe, that Beleevers themſelves (and not their Infants) ought to be baptized, according to the doctrine and practiſe of *Iohn* the Baptiſt, the Diſciples and Apoſtles of Chriſt, alſo according to the inſtitution of Baptiſme by our bleſſed Saviour.

Arg.2. Every adminiſtration of Baptiſme, that differeth eſſentially from the doctrine of Baptiſme taught by Chriſt, his Diſciples, and Apoſtles, is unlawfull; But your adminiſtration of Infant-Baptiſme, differeth eſſentially from the doctrine of Baptiſme, &c. *Ergo*, your adminiſtration of Infant-Baptiſme is unlawfull. That your adminiſtration of Infant-Baptiſme differeth eſſentially from the doctrine of Baptiſme taught by Chriſt, his Diſciples and Apoſtles, we thus prove.

Whatſoever adminiſtration of Baptiſme differeth from the doctrine of Baptiſme, in reſpect of the ſubject-matter, or forme, differeth eſſentially; But your adminiſtration of Infant-Baptiſme differeth from the doctrine of Baptiſme, in reſpect of the ſubject-matter, and in regard of your forme; *Ergo*, It differeth eſſentially. The ſubject matter of Baptiſme, according to the doctrine of Chriſt, Matth.28.19. compared with John 4.1,2. are ſuch men and women as are made Diſciples, (*viz*) Beleevers, by preaching, Mark 16.15,16. The ſubject matter of your Baptiſme, are the Infants of your Pariſhioners, whom you dreame are borne Chriſtians, and are children

of

of beleevers, becauſe their Parents are members of Alderman-Bury Church, or ſome other Pariſh Church: The ſubject matter of Baptiſme, according to the doctrine of the Diſciples and Apoſtles of Chriſt, Acts 2.38. compared with Acts 8.12.35,36,37. and Acts 19.4,5. are ſuch men and women as actually repent and beleeve. And all the Miniſters of England, have with one conſent acknowledged this truth; witneſſe againſt them, that paſſage in their Church-Catechiſme, where they uſed to aske their Communicants, What is required of perſons to be baptized? and taught them this anſwer; to wit, Repentance, whereby they forſake ſin, [that is, actuall repentance] and faith, whereby they ſtedfaſtly beleeve the promiſes of God, [which is faith that comes by hearing the word] And then they ask them another Queſtion, wherein they all confeſſe, that Infants cannot performe that which is required, and *Quere*, Why then are Infants Baptized? to which they taught them an anſwer, whereof, both themſelves and their people are aſhamed: And now they have invented another, whereof they will in time be more aſhamed; to wit, The Infants of Beleevers are Chriſtians, and faederally holy before they be baptized, and therefore to be baptized; And theſe are the ſubject matter of your Baptiſme; to wit, Infants borne in ſin, and children of wrath, who neither do actually beleeve nor repent, whom you ſay muſt be baptized, though there be no warrant in the word of God for ſuch an adminiſtration. The forme or manner of Baptiſme, according to the doctrine of Chriſt, his Diſciples, and Apoſtles, is ſuch a dipping, or waſhing of the perſon baptized in or with water, as holdeth forth their communion with Chriſt in his Death, Buriall, and Reſurrection, as appeares by theſe Scriptures, Matth. 28. 19. Acts 8.38. Heb.10.22. Rom.6.3,4. Col.2.12. 1 Cor.15.29. But your Babe-Baptiſme is adminiſtred after the invention of men, by ſprinkling their faces with water, not dipping or waſhing their bodies in water; which we affirme is to Rantize, and not to Baptize. The Greek word βαπτίζω, ſignifieth to dip, or waſh, but never to ſprinkl, 2 Kings 5.14. καὶ ἐβαπτίσατο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ἑπτάκις *Et merſit ſe in Jordane ſepties*: And he dipped himſelfe ſeven times in Jordane. So the Septuagint. *Nonnus paraphraſis* in John, pag.8. lin.12. καὶ σὺ τί βαπτίζεις πόθεν ὕδατα φαῦλα καθαίρεις. *Et tu cur immergas, unde aquâ hominem munda ficas.* Alſo *Voſſius* in his Diſpute, Theſ.1. Hiſt. Theolog. συμβαπτίζειν *Natat mergere*, and there he ſaith, it is more then ἐπιπολάζειν and leſſe then δύειν. And our Reaſons why Baptiſme ought to be thus adminiſtred by dipping or waſhing the body in water, are theſe; to wit,

 1. Be-

1. *Because*, It was administred in much water; Joh. 3. 23.

2. *Because*, It must represent a death, buriall, and resurrection; Rom. 6. 34. 1 Cor. 15. 29. Col. 2. 12.

3 *Because*, The Parties baptised are to go into the water; Matth. 3. 13. 16. and Acts 8. 38, 39.

Thus the judicious Reader (if not prejudiced) may plainly perceive, That your administration of Infant Baptisme, differeth essentially from the doctrine of baptisme which was taught by Christ, his Disciples, and Apostles; *Ergo*, Unlawfull. And your own mouthes and doctrine to your communicants have born witnesse against your selves; in that you have taught your people, that truth which the Scriptures bear witnesse of: *viz.* That actuall repentance and faith, is required in persons to be baptized: And you and all your Brethren have with one mouth confessed, that Infants cannot perform that which is required. And yet you go about to invent a reason why they should be baptized; contrary to Scripture, and your own confession; Christs doctrine, and your own.

Arg. 3. That religious worship, for which there is no command nor example in the Scripture of truth, is Will-worship, and unlawfull. But your Infant baptisme is a religious worship, for which there is no command, nor any example, written in the Scripture of truth; *Ergo*, Your Infant baptisme is Will-worship, and unlawfull.

The Reader may here take notice, that these distinctions were given us by Mr. *Cal.* and M. *Porter*, at our private Dispute at Mr. *Priggs*.

Here Mr. *Callamy* and his brethren are put hard to it, and know not how to give a satisfying answer, to either of the propositions of this Syllogisme. Some of his Brethren being perswaded in their hearts, that the Major is a truth; dare not deny it, but would answer to the Minor. Mr. *Callamy* not knowing how to avoid the truth of the Minor, would answer to the Major. And when the light of truth, that is in both the Major and Minor, did so shine forth, that Mr. *Cal.* and his Brethren could not deny either proposition, yet they did distinguish upon both propositions, and would grant neither, although true: And they thus distinguish. Mr. *Porter* saith, Though there be no expresse command nor example written in the Scripture to baptize Infants, yet there is an implicite command; which distinction was in our Dispute thus taken away. If there be any command at all to baptize Infants, it is written either in the Old or New Testament; But there is no command at all to baptize Infants, neither expresse, nor implied, written in the Old or New Testament; *Ergo*. And we say further, that seeing secret things belong to God, and things that are revealed belong to us and to our children, Let the

indiffe-

401

indifferent Reader judge, how such an un-written Tradition as Infant baptisme is (which is no where revealed either in the Old or New Testament) can belong to us and our children. But Mr. *Cal.* not liking his Brothers distinction, and answer to our Minor proposition; He gave us this answer to our Major: which in his own words we will set down. I would deny their Major, *For if a thing by just consequence; by necessary consequence, what ever it be, proved out of the Scripture by necessary consequence; though there be no command, nor no example, yet it is Scripture, as much as if there was command or example.* Although we grant, That the necessary consequences which the Apostles and Prophets (who were inspired by the holy Spirit of God) did deduct from the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and left recorded in the New Testament, are Scripture; and written for our instruction: Yet we do deny that the consequences, which Mr. *Cal.* or his Brethren (being men subject to like infirmity as our selves, and may erre) do deduct from Scriptures [not by divine inspiration, but by naturall or artificiall Logick] which Mr. *Cal.* calleth, necessary consequences, are Scripture: And the reason of our denying of such necessary consequences to be Scripture, is;

Because, They are no where written in the Scripture of Truth, but brings in that Popish Tenent of Non-written Verity; and so ushers in all Popish Innovations; as Prelacy, Common-prayer-book, Ceremonies, &c. and therefore is unsound, absurd, and sinfull: Which we make good by this Syllogisme.

Every Tenent, that brought in Prelacy, Common-prayer-book, and all Popish ceremonies, hath proved to be unsound, absurd, and sinfull, and is not now once to be named (without an *Odium*) by any of the Teachers of Gods people. But this, to wit, That necessary consequences (as Mr. *Cal.* cals them) are Scripture, is one of those Tenents that brought in Prelacy; &c. *Ergo*,

This was the Tenent by which the Parish Ministers subjected their people to Prelacy, and bound their consciences by their necessary consequences. They used thus to argue from; Rom. 13. 1,2. *Every soul ought to be subject to the higher Powers*: But the Archbishops and Lord Bishops are higher powers, *Ergo*, Every soul ought to be subject to the Archbishops & Lord Bishops. By this Tenent also, they brought the people to worship God by the Common-prayer-book; and proved it lawfull by their necessary consequences.

They used thus to argue; from, Matth. 6. 9. If a set form of prayer be lawfull, then, the Common-prayer-book is lawfull; But

a set form of prayer is lawfull ; *Ergo*, It followes by necessary consequence, That the Common-prayer-book is lawfull. And by this Tenent they brought their people to submit to all their Popish Ceremonies, *viz.* Surplice, Crosse in baptisme, and bowing at the Name of Jesus, &c.

They used thus to argue from, 1 Cor. 14. 40. *All things in the Church ought to be done decently and in Order* : But it is very decent to wear a Surplice, Cope, and Hood, to signe the Infant with the Crosse in Baptisme, and to bow at the naming of Jesus, and to kneel at the receiving of the Sacrament; also the uniformity of Pews in the Church, and the setting of the Table Altar-wise, and rayling it in ; is both very decent and orderly : *Ergo*, All these ceremonies ought to be in the Church.

Thus any who will not shut their eyes against the light, may cleerly see, that mens necessary consequences, have ushered in all Popish Innovations, and thereby the Parish Ministers have subjected their Parishioners consciences, unto their own Traditions ; and have greatly endangered the damnation of many of their Parishioners souls thereby, whilest they have taught for doctrine the commandements of men. And we dare not but tell the people, that if they will beleeve Mr. *Cal.* and his brethren, that their necessary consequences are Scripture, & whatsoever they can prove by their necessary cõsequence from the Scripture, bindes their consciences, and they ought to obey and practice whatsoever they so teach, though there be no command nor example in the Scripture for the same: They will still be brought into as great an observance of the traditiõs of men, under the Classical Presbytery, as ever they were under Lordly Episcopacy. And we dare affirm and maintain (if we may have liberty of publike Dispute with them by the leave of Authority) that the Presbyters have nothing else perswade the people to subject their consciences unto their Synodicall and Classicall Authority, their new-devised-parish-Church-worship their Rantizing of the Babes of their Parish Believers, & all the rest of their old and new traditions, but such necessary consequences: For we dare say, the Presbyters (whensoever we shall dispute with them) will be forced to confesse ; that there is no command nor example written in the Scripture of Truth, for all these things : But (yet, it is likely they will say) that they can prove all these by necessary consequences from the Scripture, and these necessary consequences are Scripture, and binde the consciences of their Parishioners to observe them. The time was, when Mr. *Cal.* and his Brethren did

think

402

think, that this was a good Argument against the Crosse in baptism, because there was no command nor example for it in the Scripture; and it was an adding to the Word, to bring in such a thing, and men could not make it an action of faith, because they have no warrant for it in the Word of God, and therefore it was sinne. This was a good Argument against the Bishops. *Whatsoever is not of Faith, is sinne.* Whatsoever we have no command nor example for written in the Scripture of Truth, we have no Faith for: *Ergo*, Was it a sinne to signe a childe in the fore-head with a Crosse in the Bishops time? because there is no Word of God for it; And is it not a sin now in the Presbyters, to sprinkle a little water upon a childes fore-head or face, and say; I baptize thee in the Name, &c. seeing they confesse there is no Word of God for it, but their own necessary consequences?

That which doth deny Christ to be come in the flesh, ought not to be done: *Arg. 4.*

But the Baptizing of Infants doth deny Christ to be come in the flesh;

Therefore ought it not to be done.

We know that no man can deny the Major, which is so clearly confirmed, 1 *Iohn* 4 3. with divers other places.

We will prove the Minor, That baptizing of Infants doth deny Christ to be come in the flesh.

That which doth take from Christ that which the Holy Spirit gives to Christ, considered come in the flesh; That denies Christ come in the flesh.

But the baptizing of Infants doth take from Christ that which the Holy Spirit gives to Christ, considered come in the flesh:

Therefore it denies Christ come in the flesh.

And for the proofe of this, we shall declare to you what we mean by that which the Holy Spirit gives to Christ considered come in the flesh.

The Holy Spirit gives to Christ a pre-eminence above all others that were before him in his Propheticall and Kingly Office. Col. 1. 18, Phil. 2. 9.

In his Propheticall Office, that neither *Moses* nor the Prophets were to be compared with him, but far inferiour to him, and his Office; So inferiour, that he was not to be expounded by them; but in giving out his mind considered come in the flesh, he was to expound and unfold them. But now men in their going about to plead for the baptizing of Infants, do exceedingly undervalue Christ's Pro- Joh. 6. 63. Mat. 11. 9. Luk. 24. 19

pheticall

pheticall Office in this, that they make the old Testament expound
Mat. 5.21, the new; whereas the new should expound the old; Christ should,
22,27,28. and doth expound *Moses*; But there is no warrant for us to bring Christ under the Exposition of *Moses*: And men do undervalue the Lord Christ, in making *Moses* speake that which Christ speakes not, or bringing *Moses* to Christ, as a greater light to unfold the lesser: They do (we say) exceedingly undervalue Christ, and that thus.

The Light unfolding, or the Wisdome unfolding, must be greater then the matter unfolded; And therefore, he that goeth about to make *Moses* mouth to speake out Christs minde, in things that concerne Christ as come in the flesh, sets up *Moses* above Christ, and denies Christ to be come in the flesh.;

Isai 9.6,7. Secondly, They exceedingly take from Christs Kingly Office;
Rev.15.3. whereas, the Holy Spirit sets up Christ a King in his Church, and a Law-giver, as equall to, so transcending all others that were before him: But, that men in the Baptizing of Infants do undervalue the Kingly Office of Christ, in giving Laws to his people. That's cleere in these two things.

Heb. 3.2, 3. First in this,, That they say, it is a duty to Baptize Infants, and Answers the minde of Christ, and yet cannot shew a command from Christ; whereas the Apostle saith, *Christ was as faithfull in his house, as Moses.* And you know the faithfulnesse of *Moses* did consist in this, That he gave Laws and Commands to the Israelites, to declare their duty; and layes nothing upon them as a duty, but what they had a cõmand for. And seeing he gave them Laws for every thing they were to observe, and if Christ was as faithfull in his house as he; we will leave this to the judgement of the wise; whether or no that this doth not undervalue the Kingly Office of Christ, to say, That Baptizing of Infants is a duty that they owe to Christ; and yet can shew no command for it from Christ.

Secondly, They undervalue the Kingly Office of Christ, in giving Laws to his Church in this; That they go about to performe (as they say) a duty to Christ, but can shew no command for it from Christ; but must use their owne Art and Reason to make Christs Law strong enough to hold it out to be a duty. And whether the joyning of mans Art, Policy, and Reason, to the Laws of Christ, doth not exceedingly undervalue Christ, as though his Laws were not perfect enough for his people, we leave the wise to judge. And in so doing, they do exceedingly take (as before we said from the Prophetical, so here on the Kingly Office of Christ) that Honour and Preheminency from him,

him, which the Holy Spirit gives to him, considered as come in the flesh: And therefore so to do, denies Christ as come in the flesh.

That which is no part of Righteousnesse, ought not to be observed: But the baptizing of Infants is no part of Righteousnesse. And therefore it ought not to be observed. *Arg.5.*

The Major Proposition none can deny: I will prove the Minor, and that thus:

Whatsoever is considered as a part of Righteousnesse, was seen either in the person or practise of Jesus Christ.

But neither in the person nor practise of Jesus Christ, is the baptizing of Infants seen or held forth:

Therefore it is no part of Righteousnesse.

And that whatsoever is a part of Righteousnesse, was seen in the person or practise of Jesus Christ, is clear from this Scripture, Matth. 3.15. *And Iesus said, suffer it be so for thus it to becommeth us to fulfill all Righteousnesse.* If all Righteousnesse, then there was no Righteousnesse but was considered either in the person or practise of Christ. And that the *Baptizing of Infants* is not held out in the person or practise of Christ; We leave the wise to judge. He himself was not baptized when he was an Infant, though he might pleade the same priviledge as they do, who say they are children of believers: Had it been a part of Righteousnesse, Christ would, nay, Christ should have done it.

If you Object, and say, There was none to baptize him before. *Obj.*

We answer, had it been a part of Righteousnesse, God in a providence would have provided one before, as well as then; for he was to *fulfill all Righteousnesse.* And for his practise (*though he baptized not, but his Disciples, Ioh. 4 2.*) yet, in all their baptizing where Christ was, you never hear that ever they *Baptized any Infant*, or gave any command for it; And therefore it is no part of Righteousnesse, and ought not to be done. *Answ.*

Those onely ought to be baptized, who are accounted the seed of ABRAHAM, either after the flesh, or according to the Faith. But none of the Infants of Believing Gentiles, are accounted the seed of ABRAHAM, either after the flesh, or according to the Faith; *Ergo*, they ought not to be baptized. *Arg 6.*

The Major proposition Mr. *Cal.* and his Brethren will not deny; Because, It is their own doctrine, and one of their principles, whereby they would prove; That the Infants of Believers ought to be

 bapti-

baptized: We do but borrow their own weapon, to give their Infant baptiſme its deadly wound.

The Aſſumption, to wit, that none of the Infants of Believing Gentiles, are acaccounted the ſeed of ABRAHAM, either after the fleſh, or according to the Faith, we thus prove.

Firſt, Becauſe the Jews or Iſraelites onely, and not any of the Gentiles, are counted the ſeed of ABRAHAM after the fleſh; to wit, by naturall generation or off-ſpring: So then none of the Infants of Believing Gentiles, are accounted for the fleſhly ſeed of ABRAHAM.

Secondly, Becauſe Believers onely themſelves, and not their Infants, are accounted the ſpirituall ſeed of ABRAHAM, or his ſeed according to the Faith, Gal. 3. 29. If you be Chriſts, then you are ABRAHAMS ſeed, and heires according to the promiſe. And ABRAHAM is called, Rom. 4. 12. The father of all them that believe. But it is no where ſaid in Scripture, that ABRAHAM is the father of all their children too. Nay, the contrary is witneſſed by the Apoſtle *Paul*, Rom. 9. 6, 7, 8, 9. They which are the children of the fleſh, theſe are not the children of God; but the children of the promiſe are counted for the ſeed.

We conceive, that this Scripture doth expound, Gen. 17. God made an everlaſting covenant of Grace with ABRAHAM and his ſeed. Now the Scriptures declare, that ABRAHAM had two kindes of ſeed; the one born after the fleſh, the other born after the Spirit, Gal. 4. 29. The queſtion is, who are counted for *Abrahams* ſeed according to the covenant of Grace?

We anſwer, not *Iſmael*, nor any one born after the fleſh, but *Iſaac*, and every one born after the ſpirit. And the Apoſtle delivers this, as the minde of God, Rom. 9. 7, 8. Neither becauſe they are the ſeed of ABRAHAM, are they all children; but in *Iſaac* ſhall thy ſeed be called: That is, ſaith the Apoſtle, they which are the children of the fleſh, theſe are not the children of GOD; but the children of the promiſe are counted for the ſeed. Alſo *Paul* further cleers this truth, in the 4. chapt. to the Gal. verſ. 22. to the end.

For it is written, that *Abraham* had two ſons, the one by a Bondwoman, the other by a free-woman; But he who was of the bondwoman [to wit, *Iſhmael*] was born after the fleſh; but he of the freewoman [to wit, *Iſaac*] was by promiſe; which things are an Allegory: For theſe are the two Covenants, &c. verſ. 24. So that the Apoſtle

ſtle witneſſeth, that there are two Covenants, which GOD made with ABRAHAM and his ſeed; to wit, a covenant of Workes with *Abrahams* fleſhly ſeed, and a covenant of Grace with *Abrahams* ſpirituall ſeed; which was ſet forth Allegorically, in *Iſhmael* and *Iſaac*. And here hath Mr. *Cal.* and his brethren been miſtaken, in bringing an Argument to prove Infant baptiſme, drawn from *Abrahams* fleſhly ſeed; affirming, that there is but one Covenant in that Scripture, and that is a covenant of Grace. And ſo have concluded; That all the fleſhly ſeed of *Abraham* (and by their neceſſary conſequences) all the fleſhly ſeed of believing Gentiles, are the children of God, and are to be counted for the ſeed with whom God hath made an everlaſting covenant of Grace. Contrary to theſe Scriptures, Rom. 9. 6, 7, 8, 9. and Gal. 4. 22, 23, 24. to the end.

Neither doth that promiſe, Gen. 17. 7. in the leaſt concern the ſeed of the Gentiles; but the Jews onely, who were *Abrahams* ſeed after the fleſh.

Thus then we underſtand the Scripture; That the children of the fleſh, to wit, thoſe who are born after the fleſh, or of the fleſh, are fleſh; Joh. 3. 6. That is, are ſinfull; being conceived in ſin, and ſhapen in iniquity, Pſal. 51. and by naturall generation, are the children of wrath as well as others: Epheſ. 2. 3. They are not the children of God, untill they be born again, or born of God; Joh. 1. 13. and Joh. 3. 3. 5, 6. But the children of the promiſe, that is, thoſe who are in Chriſt, are counted for the ſeed. Gal. 3. 29. And we brethren (to wit, who are believers) as *Iſaac* was, are children of the promiſe. Gal. 4. 28.

But ſome may think, that this will put the children of Believers into as bad a condition, as the children of Turkes, Heathens, and any other wicked men; and this they are perſwaded is an horrible thing, and a dangerous opinion. We put not the children of Believers into as bad a condition as the children of Turkes, &c. It was *Adams* diſobedience in eating the forbidden fruit, that put all his poſterity equally into a ſinfull and miſerable condition, Rom. 5. 12. 19. And the doctrine which Mr. CAL. and his brethren teach, doth the like. They ſay (and it is truth) that all the Infants of Believers, are ſhapen in iniquity, and in ſin doth their mothers conceive them; Yea they are born in ſin, and are by nature children of wrath as well as others. And now let the Reader judge, Whether this their own doctrine, do not put the children of Believers into as bad a condition, as any

Turks, Heathens, or wicked mens children; Why then ſhould they go about to perſwade the people, that our Opinion, That the Infants of Believers ſhould not be baptized, is by no meanes to be received; becauſe (they ſay) it puts their children into as bad a condition, as the children of Turks, Heathens, &c. when as their own doctrine doth the like. And ſome of their doctrines touching the Infants of Believers, puts them into a worſe condition; to wit, into a condition of falling away from grace. For they affirm, that the Infants of Believers are within the covenant of Grace, and therefore are to be baptized; So Mr. *Marſhall* Sermon about Infant-baptiſme, *Pag.* 8. & 37. And Mr. *Blake Pag.* 16. Alſo, this their judgement appears by the Directory; where the Pariſh Miniſters are directed at baptizing of Children, to teach; That the promiſes of the covenant of Grace, is made to believers and their Infants. And that the Scripture which they continually produce, tends to prove this their opinion, to wit, Acts 2. 39. And yet they are forced to confeſſe, that ſome of the children of Believers prove very prophane, and notoriouſly wicked, yea live ſo, and dye ſo, and are damned.

So then by their own doctrine and confeſſion, ſome of the infants of believers who are in the covenant of Grace, may periſh in their ſins, and be damned. Doth not this uphold that *Arminian* Tenent of falling away from Grace? and the Popiſh doctrine, That perſons may be in the ſtate of *Peter* to day, and in the ſtate of *Judas* to morrow? We would have ſaid more to this thing, but Mr, *Tombes* in his Examen of Mr. *Marſhals* Sermon about Infant-baptiſme; *Pag.* 45. 46. unto the 54. *page*, hath handled this point very ſoundly. And we could earneſtly deſire every one, who queſtions Infant-baptiſme, to reade over Mr. *Tombes* his Booke very ſeriouſly.

Arg. 7. It is not lawfull, to apply or adminiſter any Ordinance of Chriſt otherwiſe then according to the Rule of the Word.

But to baptize any Infants, is to apply or adminiſter an Ordinance of Chriſt, otherwiſe then according to the Rule of the Word:

Ergo, It is not lawfull to baptize any Infants.

The truth of the Propoſition appears;

1. All will-worſhip is expreſly condemned in the Scripture; See Coloſſ. 2. 23. But every adminiſtration and application of an Ordinance of Chriſt, otherwiſe then according to the Rule of the Word, is manifeſtly will-worſhip.

2. It

2. It is ſuch an adding to that which God hath commanded, as is forbidden in Deut. 12. 32.

3 In this caſe we ſhould be found to revive for doctrines the commandements of men; and our fear towards God would be found to be taught by the precepts of men: the evill whereof, appears in Iſaiah 29. 13. and Matth. 15. 9.

4. In doing this, we ſhall never be able to anſwer the demand in *Iſaiah* 1 12 *Who hath required this at your hands?* But we ſhall be found doers of thoſe things which God commanded not, neither came they into his heart; touching which, ſee Jerem. 7. 31.

5. If Chriſt have not given compleate directions in his Word, concerning the uſe of his Ordinances, how then is he faithfull to him that appointed him, (not onely as the high-Prieſt, but alſo as the Apoſtle of our profeſſion, and as the Prophet whom God raiſed up like unto *Moſes*,) even as *Moſes* alſo was faithfull in all Gods houſe? See Deut. 18. 15. and Heb. 3. 1, 2.

And if he have given ſuch compleate directions, Is it not then unlawfull to apply or uſe his Ordinances, otherwiſe then according to his owne directions?

6. If it be lawfull to apply or uſe the Ordinances of Chriſt, otherwiſe then according to the rule of the Word, or otherwiſe then may be warranted and juſtified by the Word; then both Jews and Turks, and other ſuch, both young and old, may be admitted to the Ordinances: But this they all acknowledge unlawfull to be done.

Now, that the Baptizing of Infants is an applying or adminiſtring of Baptiſme, (which is an Ordinance of Chriſt) otherwiſe then according to the rule of the Word, and otherwiſe then may be warranted and juſtified by the Word; and ſo now proved unlawfull, we thus confirme.

1. There is in the Scripture no precept enjoyning us, no rule directing us, nor any example ſhewing it lawfull for us to baptize Infants.

2. The onely written Commiſſion to Baptize (which is in Matth. 28. 19.) directeth us to baptize Diſciples onely, *Goe ye and Diciple all Nations, baptizing them*; that is, the Diſciples: for this is the onely conſtruction and interpretation that the Greek word can there beare; and Infants cannot be made Diſciples, becauſe they cannot learne.

3. Thoſe onely of the Jews might be baptized that did repent, as

 appeares

appeares in Acts 2.38. and the onely of the Gentiles that did sincerely beleeve; as appeares in Acts 8.37.

4. In Acts 8.12. it is fully related who were baptized in Samaria, *viz.* not Infants, but men and women, when they believed.

5. Then onely is Baptisme administred according to the rule of the Word, when a Disciple is Baptized into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, &c. Matth.28.19. that is, into the profession of faith in the Father, Son, and holy Spirit; so the Apostle minds the Corinthians, that they had not beene baptized into the Name of *Paul*, 1 Cor.1.13. that is, into the profession of faith in *Paul*: this necessarily excludes Infants, who can make no such profession. The supply of this want of profession, by the profession of those that have beene called Sureties, doth now appeare to all wise men, to be as ridiculous and absurd as Pædo-rantisme (now falsely called, Infant-Baptisme) will shortly appeare to be, to all the godly.

6. All those that are baptized according to the rule of the Word, are looked upon as persons submitting themselves to the use of Baptisme by the direction of the holy Spirit; 1 Cor.12.13. This also manifestly excludes all Infants.

Arg.8. If Christ commanded not his Apostles to practise or teach the baptizing of Infants, then Infants ought not to be Baptized. But Christ commanded not his Apostles to practise, &c. *Ergo*,

That Christ commanded not his Apostles to practise, or teach Infants Baptisme, is manifest; because the Apostles, in obedience to Christs word, Mat.28.20. taught the faithfull to observe all things that Christ commanded them. But no man can say that the Apostles taught the faithfull to observe the baptizing of Infants, unlesse with the Papists he will flye to unwritten Traditions, falsly so called Apostolicall.

Arg.9. If the doctrine maintaining Infants Baptisme, be no part of the revealed counsell of God, then Infants ought not to be baptized; For things that are revealed belong to us and to our children. But it is no part of the revealed counsell of God, as appeares by the Apostles not declaring it. See Acts 20.27. *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized.

FINIS.

478086